

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 14 2010

Claims

What is claimed is:

1. (Currently amended) A system and method process to give a true indication of respondent satisfaction to an electronic questionnaire survey which is characterised by asking the respondent or plurality of respondents to give their answers to two sets of questions with both sets of questions being based on similar statements, but posed differently, so that the first said set of questions are answered emotionally by the said respondent and the second said set of questions are answered rationally, ranking the responses to both said sets of questions, and comparing the said rankings from both said sets of questions and based on these results, recording values for satisfaction and level of conviction, both of which can be presented to said respondent at the time of said survey.
2. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of subdividing the subject matter of the said questionnaire survey into common groups in which the said statements are equally distributed in number amongst the groups and are ranked within the group according to the importance of the statement to the survey initiator.
3. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of defining two sets of said similar statements in which both sets of statements contain sentences with the same meaning, but using different words so that the first said set can be used in a set of questions designed to be responded to emotionally and the second said set can be combined to answer the questions rationally.
4. (Cancelled)
5. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of defining a said second set of said questions in which the said second set of questions dynamically group together a number of statements from the said second set of statements at the time of questionnaire based on the responses to said first set of statements, which force the respondent to respond rationally.

6. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 5 of grouping together a number of statements from the said second set of statements in which the said statement groupings depend upon the respondent's answers to the said first set of questions.
7. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 5 in which the said questions are defined so that the respondent is forced to respond rationally to the said group of statements.
8. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking the said responses to the said first set of questions in which said respondent's emotional response has a value calculated, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's emotional responses to the said questions and then ranked.
9. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking the said responses to the said second set of questions in which said respondent's rational response has a value calculated, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's rational responses to the said questions and then ranked.
10. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 1 of comparing the said emotional and rational responses from the said respondent or plurality of respondents in which the closeness of match of said emotional and rational responses is quantifiably measured, thereby giving a value for respondent or plurality of respondents' satisfaction.
11. (Cancelled)
12. (Cancelled)
13. (Currently amended) A system and method of having stored responses to the said first part of a questionnaire from said respondent stored in a system, which is either stand alone or part of a network in its broadest sense such as a local area network (LAN) or wide area network (WAN), from an input device, the so that said responses are can then be processed in a central processing unit in the said system and based on the results, the questions said second set of statements for the said second part of the questionnaire are dynamically arranged and presented as said second set of questions on a display device to the

said respondent for completion; after which the said respondent's resulting input on the said input device is once again registered and processed in the said processing unit and finally stored in a storage device. At this stage device, so that a summary of the said respondent's results can be presented to the said respondent in both a textual and graphical format on the said display device should it be so desired.

14. (Cancelled)

15. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 13 of giving the said respondent immediate feedback in which a textual and/or graphical summary of their input is shown immediately on the said display device following their completion of the electronic questionnaire survey.

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Currently amended) A system process, either standalone or part of a network in its broadest sense such as a local area network (LAN) or wide area network (WAN), capable of capturing and summarising inputs from a questionnaire survey from a respondent or plurality of respondents such that each questionnaire survey originator is able to see the results not only for their own entity, but also for a plurality of entities, typically in the same industry (consisting of like-minded survey originators) thereby allowing industry wide benchmarking, which, because of the repeatability of the present invention, now becomes possible, for those surveys where such a feature would be beneficial.

20. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 19 of assigning values to the said respondents emotional responses which allow a simple summary of emotional responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition.

21. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 19 of assigning values to the said respondents rational responses which allow a simple summary of rational responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition.
22. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 19 of adding the results of the emotional responses of all respondents in the survey originator's entity as well as their rational responses and comparing the two results, so that values can be mathematically assigned to both the entity's satisfaction and level of conviction which are representative for the whole entity and are both devoid of human emotion and repeatable.
23. (Currently amended) A The method according to claim 19 of presenting the results from the said survey both textually and graphically so that the survey originator sees both a summary of their own entity's results for satisfaction and level of conviction as well as the results of a plurality of entities, thereby allowing an immediate benchmarking.